



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE NEW "FRAGMENT OF AN UN-CANONICAL GOSPEL"¹.

THIS short but instructive fragment presents a hitherto unknown criticism by Jesus of the ceremonial purification current in the Temple ritual. It is in the form of a dialogue with a priestly official in the inner court of the sacred edifice. The text gives us so many new details concerning the strict laws of purification and the practice of them in the sanctuary at Jerusalem, that Jewish scholars must feel an even greater interest in the fragment than do Christians. The editors, with their usual diligence, have given an exact transcription of the text, a translation, and a commentary. In the latter they received the help of Prof. E. Schürer, the well-known author of *Geschichte des jüd. Volkes zur Zeit Jesu Christi*. He, together with the editors, concludes that Jewish tradition does not confirm the exaggerated statements of the fragment. To remind readers of the exact wording of the text, we venture to cite in full the translation which the able editors have provided.

And he took them and brought them into the very place of purification, and was walking in the temple.

And a certain Pharisee, a chief priest, whose name was Levi (?), met them and said to the Saviour, Who gave thee leave to walk in this place of purification and to see these holy vessels, when thou hast not washed nor yet have thy disciples bathed their feet? But defiled thou hast walked in this temple, which is a pure place, wherein no other man walks except he has washed himself and changed his garments, neither does he venture to see these holy vessels.

¹ *Fragment of an Uncanonical Gospel from Oxyrhynchus*, edited with translation and commentary by B. P. GRENFELL and A. S. HUNT, with one plate. (Published for the Egypt Exploration Fund by H. FROWDE, Oxford University Press, 1908, price 1s. net.)

And the Saviour straightway stood still with his disciples and answered him, Art thou then, being here in the temple, clean?

He saith unto him, I am clean; for I washed in the pool of David, and having descended by one staircase I ascended by another, and I put on white and clean garments, and then I came and looked upon these holy vessels.

The Saviour answered and said unto him, Woe ye blind, who see not. Thou hast washed in these running waters wherein dogs and swine have been cast night and day, and hast cleansed and wiped the outside skin which also the harlots and flute-girls anoint and wash and wipe and beautify for the lust of men; but within they are full of scorpions and all wickedness. But I and my disciples, who thou sayest have not bathed, have been dipped in the waters of eternal life which come from . . . But woe unto the . . .

The editors declare that the whole fragment is historically worthless, because of the impossibility of reconciling this picture with actually known facts. In particular they maintain (p. 12):—

But that an ordinary Jew before visiting the inner court of the Temple had to wash and change his clothes as stated in ll. 18-20 is not confirmed by any other evidence; and neither the "place of purification" in l. 8, nor the "pool of David" in l. 25 are mentioned elsewhere, while considerable difficulty arises in connexion with the sacred vessels which are stated to have been visible from the court to which Jesus and his disciples had penetrated. Moreover the two stairways leading down to the "pool of David" and still more the statement that dogs and swine were cast into it (ll. 33-4) seem to be details invented for the sake of rhetorical effect, for that a high priest washed himself in a pool of the character described in the fragment is incredible.

On the contrary, it seems to me that the writer of this Gospel was accurately informed on all these matters, and that tradition fully confirms the details which sound so incredible. I am not concerned with the authenticity of the fragment, but with its interpretation, through clear, trustworthy, and easily accessible parallels in the Mishnah and Talmud. I must premise that I am presenting my results without that full consideration which I should have preferred to give them. The editors of this REVIEW

have, however, pressed me to put my notes together without delay, and I did not feel able to withstand their wishes.

In the first instance it is certain, as the editors already remark, that the dialogue is represented as taking place in the inner court (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ) in which Jesus was walking. The site of the incident can in no way be the actual Temple, for no layman could enter it at all, even after the most complete washings and purifications. But though any Jewish layman could enter the inner court, he could only do so when complete levitical purification had first occurred. This is shown by the negative rule in *Kelim* i. 8: "The inner court of the Israelites is of higher sanctity than it (the Court of the Women), in so far as no one may enter the former who has not yet brought the requisite sacrifice after having been purified from a levitical uncleanness¹." The offering could only be brought after a complete purification consisting of washing the garments and bathing the body (*Lev.* xiv. 9; xv. 13; *Num.* xix. 19). The same is stated by Josephus (*Wars*, v. 5. 6): "Men who are not fully purified (καθάπιν ἡγνευκότες) are excluded from the inner sanctuary." By the expression "fully purified" Josephus means in the first instance immersion in a bath, but it will be seen from further consideration that his prescription applies not only to those who have contracted levitical impurity, but to *all* who desire to enter the inner court, whether they had previously been in a state of levitical uncleanness or not. This is shown by what he says *Against Apion*, ii. 8: "In tertiam (porticum) masculi Iudaeorum mundi existentes atque purificati," i.e. "In the third court entrance was lawful only to male Jews who were clean and purified." Josephus does not restrict the prescribed purification only to those who had been levitically unclean, but applies the rule to *all*

¹ עזרת ישראל מקדשה ממנה (מעזרת נשים) שאין מחוסר כפורים נכנס לשם, Schürer (*Geschichte*, II, 273, n. 59) wrongly translates מחוסר כפורים, "der wegen irgend einer Verfehlung das vorgeschriebene Opfer nicht dargebracht hat."

who entered the inner court. But the term *purificati* must mean "purified by immersion in a bath" and corresponds to the Greek ἄγνοι or ἄγιοι. This is clear from Josephus's usage of this phrase elsewhere. Thus *Wars*, vi. 9. 3, he records of the visitors to the Temple on the Passover γίνονται δ' ἀνδρῶν . . . καθαρῶν ἀπάντων καὶ ἁγίων, i. e. "They were all clean and holy," and these terms correspond to the *mundi atque purificati* of the former passage, and as in the former passage apply to all laymen and not only to those who had been unclean. So, too, in *Antiq.* xv. 2. 5, where Josephus says of the Court of the Women: "On the East side there is one great gate through which we enter when in a purified state (ἄγνοι) with our women." The historian again in *Wars*, iv. 3. 12 relates: "Ananus (who with his followers held possession of the outer court of the Temple) thought it sinful to lead the people into the inner court without precedent purification (προηγνευκώς)." Thereupon John the Zealot informs his friends in the inner court that the followers of Ananus have announced their intention to purify themselves on the next day (ἀγνείαν δὲ παρηγγέλλεσθαι) so that the people could enter the inner court under the pretext of performing the divine service (*Wars*, iv. 3. 14). And in *Antiq.*, xiv. 11. 5 (*Wars*, i. 11. 6) the High Priest Hyrcanus attempts to prevent Herod and his non-Jewish soldiers from entering Jerusalem on the ground that being a festival the people within had purified themselves (ἀγνεύοντος τοῦ πλήθους). And when Paul accompanied the four Nazirites into the Temple he first purified himself (ἀγνισθείς), and then entered the sacred precincts (Acts xxi. 26).

The foregoing evidence suffices to confirm the Gospel fragment before us in its implication that no layman could enter the inner court of the Temple without previous purification. But in what did this purification consist? It consisted in immersion in a bath. This is shown by Josephus's language when rendering the biblical prescription concerning the Levites in Num. viii. 7 ("Let them wash

their clothes and so *make themselves clean*"), and *ibid.* ver. 21 ("And the Levites *were purified* and washed their clothes'). Josephus renders (*Antiq.* iii. 11. 1): "He purified them (ἡγνυζε) with ever-flowing spring-water and with sacrifices." It is obvious, therefore, that when he uses the same Greek term for purification in the case of laymen, he also means *bathing*. Further examples of Josephus's use of the term conclusively confirm this inference, that by purification he meant immersion in water. He says of the Essenes (*Wars*, ii. 8. 5): "After work in the forenoon they wash their body in cold water, after this cleansing (μετὰ ταύτην τὴν ἀγνείαν) they betake themselves to a special building which no member of another sect may enter and gather themselves here in the eating hall as though they entered a sanctuary." Here Josephus uses the same word (ἀγνεία) as he does of entry into the Temple, and here he distinctly explains it to mean *bathing*. In the passage of doubtful authenticity in which Josephus refers to John the Baptist (*Antiq.*, xviii. 5. 2) baptism is described as ἐφ' ἀγνείᾳ τοῦ σώματος. Finally, the same expression is used of purifying the robe of the high-priest before the festivals. The Romans held possession of the robe and handed it over to the Jews a week before the feast (*Antiq.*, xviii. 4. 3). This purification (ἀγνισθέειν) can be nothing other than washing¹. Josephus's use of ἁγνός or ἅγιος ("holy") in the sense of purified is quite parallel with the use of the Hebrew term קדש. This latter verb also means to cleanse, as in *Exod.* xix. 10 (וקדשתם היום ומחר וכבסו שמלותם); also *ibid.* v. 14 (וקדש את העם וכבסו שמלותם); *Antiq.*, iii. 5. 1, ἀγνεύοντες τὴν τε ἄλλην ἀγνείαν), and *Lev.* xvi. 19 (וטהרו וקדשו מטומאות בני ישראל). It is not without importance for the present argument that the washing of hands and feet by the priests before their service is termed in the Mishnah קדוש ידים ורגלים.

But all doubts as to the meaning of these rules con-

¹ That the material of which the high-priest's robe was made could be washed is seen from the fact that the curtain (פריכת) which was made of the same substance was actually washed (*Shekalim*, VIII, 5).

cerning purification before entering the inner court are removed by the Rabbinic tradition. The Mishnah, *Yoma*, III, 3, lays it down that: "No man may enter the inner court for offering sacrifice, even though he be clean, without previously bathing himself" (אין אדם נכנס לעזרה לעבודה אפילו) (טהור עד שיטבול). It might seem from the context and from the word 'aboda that this rule applies exclusively to priests. But the Talmud Yerushalmi (*Yoma*, III, 40 b) remarks on this passage that the word 'aboda must not be pressed in this way, as the same rule applies to such as enter the court without intention to offer sacrifice (אפילו שלא לעבודה). The Tosefta (*Negaim*, VIII, 9) and the parallel Baraitha (*Yoma*, 30 b) expressly confirm this. "A man recovered from leprosy bathes in the chamber of the lepers, and then goes and stands in the Nicanor Gate. Rabbi Judah says: He does not need to bathe, for he has already bathed overnight. They said to him: He does not bathe under this category [i.e. because he has recovered from leprosy], but every one who enters the inner court by way of the Nicanor Gate has to bathe in that chamber¹". Since the Nicanor Gate leads directly to the Altar, everybody entering by it must take the precaution to bathe on the spot. It was enough for the pilgrim entering from any other gate to have previously bathed at home. To facilitate such bathings the authorities in every place had to prepare the baths before the pilgrim festivals, and had to provide for every requisite of the purification rite (Mishnah, *Shekalim*, I, 1; Tosefta, *Shekalim*, I, 1-2). In reference to this duty R. Isaac says: "Every man must purify himself before each pilgrim feast" (חייב אדם לטהר) (עצמו ברגל, *Rosh Ha Shana*, 16 b; *Sifra*, 49 a).

It may now be held proved that every layman who entered the inner court had to purify himself by bathing.

¹ מצורע מובל בלשכת המצורעים ובא ושומד בשער ניקנור. רבי יהודה אומר לא היה צריך טבילה שכבר טבל במצורע. אמרו לו לא מן השם הוא זה אלא כל הנכנס לעזרה דרך שיערי ניקנור היה מובל באותה לשכה. The Baraitha differs in minor points, and R. Judah says בלבר אלא כל אדם.

Thus the statement of the new Gospel Fragment on this point is fully justified by the facts.

We now come to the second point on which the accuracy of the fragment has been questioned, but here again, it will be shown, the fragment is in accordance with the facts of tradition. I refer to the statement that the layman on entering the inner court changed his garments. Not only was such a change of garments incumbent upon one who had incurred an actual uncleanness, but also any one who purified himself in order to appear before the Lord was, even by the Bible, required to purify his garments or to change them for other (clean) attire. In Gen. xxxv. 2 we read: "Then Jacob said unto his household, and to all that were with him, Put away the strange gods that are among you, and be clean, and change your garments." Exod. xix. 10: "And the Lord said unto Moses, Go unto the people and sanctify them to-day and to-morrow, and let them wash their clothes." Josephus, rendering the latter text (*Antiq.*, iii. v. 1), says: "They adorned themselves, their wives and children, with garments in a luxurious fashion." We would, therefore, anticipate that the Jewish pilgrim when visiting the Temple on festivals would wear festival garments. Josephus clearly represents this as being the case in a passage dealing with the solemn meeting of the high-priest Jaddua with Alexander the Great (*Antiq.*, xi. 8. 4). We are there told how God spoke to the anxious High Priest: "Wreathe the city and open the gates; then let the people go, in white garments—thou, however, with the priests, in the robes prescribed for you—to meet the king." As the high-priest and the other priests are here wearing their official robes, it is inferrable that the white garments of the people are also the clothes worn by the laity during the sacrifices. In this way we explain a difficulty in Hegesippus's account (quoted by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, ii. 23) concerning James the brother of Jesus. "James was a Nazirite, and to him alone it was permitted to enter the sanctuary, for he wore no woollen,

but only a linen garment. He always went alone into the Temple, where one might find him on his knees praying for the forgiveness of the people." This implies that, like an Essene, he regularly wore white linen clothes, which, again like an Essene, he put on after bathing. Therefore James was able to enter the inner court of the Temple every day, a thing which the ordinary Jewish layman only did on festivals. It seems to me clear from this that any visitor to the inner court was bound to wear clean clothes. The priest in our Gospel fragment, who sees Jesus walking in the inner court in every-day dress was able at once to recognize that Jesus had not bathed. "And a certain . . . chief priest . . . met them, and said, Who gave thee leave to walk in the place of purification and to see these holy vessels *when thou hast not washed*." The inseparable connexion between changing the dress and taking a bath is precisely expressed in the *Mechilta* to Exod. xix. 10 (ed. Friedmann, 64 a): "There is no washing of clothes in the Bible without bathing the person" (אין כיבוס בתורה שאין טעון טבילה).

If, then, the preceding arguments be found convincing, the editors of the fragment do an injustice to its author when they say (p. 20): "Schürer, therefore, seems to be right in supposing that the author of the Gospel has by mistake referred to laymen the regulations applicable only to priests." I hold, on the contrary, that these regulations did apply to laymen.

We now approach another of the difficulties which, in the view of the editors, stand in the way of accepting the accuracy of the fragment. I refer to the inspection of the holy vessels by Jesus and his companions. It can be shown, however, that on the day after the festivals such sight of the holy vessels by laymen was well within the range of possibility.

The priest in the fragment three times over reproaches Jesus and his disciples because they "look at the holy vessels without bathing or washing their feet" (ἰδεῖν

[ταῦ]τα τὰ ἅγια σκεύη μήτε λουσα[μ]έν[φ] μ[ή]τε μὴν τῶν μαθητῶν σου τοὺς π[όδας βα]πτισθέντων). To the priest this seems of much concern, and the sin against the Temple-laws is to him a serious one. The editors rightly point out that the holy vessels could not be seen usually from the inner court. But they have overlooked the passage in the Mishnah which removes the difficulty, and which places the whole scene of the fragment in its right setting. It will be seen that the incident occurred on the day after a festival, when all the holy vessels were, in point of fact, transferred to a washing-place in the inner court. It is necessary to quote in full the Mishnah, *Hagiga*, III, 7-8: "Immediately after the pilgrim-feast they go through the purification of the inner court. How do they proceed? They immerse in water the vessels which were in the Temple, and say to them [the priests]: 'Take care that ye touch not the Table and the Candlestick, and thereby defile it.' All the vessels in the sanctuary were duplicated and triplicated, so that if the first set became unclean they could bring the second set in their place. All the vessels which were in the Temple require immersion in water, except the golden and the brazen altars. These, according to R. Eliezer, are regarded as fixed to the ground. But the sages say, the difference in the case of the altars was due to the fact that they were covered with metal [and thus were not susceptible to defilement]¹." That this Mishnah deals with actual fact and not with mere theory is shown by the case reported in Talmud Yerushalmi, *Hagiga*, III, 79 d (Tosefta, *Hagiga*, III, 35): "On a certain occasion they immersed the Candlestick in water, and the Sadducees said: 'See the Pharisees bathe the orb of the sun².'"

¹ משעבר הרגל היו מעבירין על שדרת העזרה . . . (8) כיצד מעבירין על שדרת העזרה? • משבילין את הכלים שהיו במקדש ואומרין להן הזהרו שלא תגעו בשולחן ובמנורה ותשמיאיהו • כל הכלים שהיו במקדש יש להם שניים ושלישים שאם: פמאו הראשונים יביאו שניים תחתיהן • כל דכלים שהיו במקדש פשעין שביניה חוץ ממנורה הוהב ומנבה הנחשת כפני שהן כקרקע, דברי רבי אליעזר • והכמים אומרים מפני שהן מצופין • Confer the text of the Mishnah in the Palestinian Talmud, the Cambridge Mishnah, ed. Löwe and Rabbinowicz.

² פעם אחת הטבילו את המנורה אמרו צרוקים ראו פרושים מטבילין גלגל חמה • the

Again, R. Simeon b. Gamliel in the name of Simeon the son of the Segan relates (*Shekalim*, VIII, 5) that for the immersion of the curtain three hundred priests were required. A non-priest was not permitted to see these vessels without having received purification, just as the Levites (Num. iv. 19) were not allowed to see the ark uncovered. The vessels were never seen by laymen except on occasion of their purification on the day after the festival. As by that day all the pilgrims had left, it must have been very unusual for a layman to visit the inner court and disturb the priest at his work. But, though unusual, there was nothing in the Temple regulations to prevent such intrusion, provided always that the visitor had washed and changed his garments¹.

The next point in the fragment that needs elucidation is the "very place of purification" (ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγνευτήριου), into which Jesus is represented as introducing his disciples. This ἀγνευτήριον was not the inner court itself, as the editors suggest (p. 10). But it was a chamber of that court, in which there was a bathing-place. There were several such chambers provided with baths. The one referred to here cannot be the subterranean one which the priests used for their own purification (*Tamid*, I, 1), for a layman could not have found admission to it. Besides, the whole narrative is inconsistent with a subterranean site. But there were two other chambers, above ground, either of which may be identical with the ἀγνευτήριον of our text. These two chambers were—(a) the Parva-chamber, which had on its first floor a bath used by the

Tosefta : ומעשה שהמבילין את המנורה והיו צדוקין אומרים בואו וראו פרושים שמבטלין במאור הלילה.

¹ It cannot be supposed that this post-festal purification of the vessels occurred outside the inner court, for it was not lawful to remove the vessels from the inner court, although R. Meir (*Shekalim*, VIII, 4) says that when the curtain has become unclean in the first degree (אב המוכיאה), it had to be cleaned outside the inner court. The new Gospel confirms, and is confirmed by the prescription, that the vessels were purified in the inner court.

high-priest on the Day of Atonement (*Yoma*, III, 3 ; *Middoth*, V, 3 ; T. B. *Yoma*, 19 a) ; and (b) a bath over the Water-Gate, which was also used by the high-priest on the Day of Atonement (Baraitha in *Yoma*, 19 a). There may have been others, and these two may have been used on other occasions, but no details have come down to us concerning them. It is, therefore, not possible to decide the exact site intended in our text, but it is certain that it stood in one of the chambers of the inner court, and on that side of the chamber further removed from the court. It will be remembered that the chambers were constructed in the thickness of the Temple wall, and that they could be approached on two sides, one towards the *hel*, and the other towards the 'azara (inner court). Into the part opening from the *hel* laymen were admitted, though they were excluded from the other side. The two divisions of the chamber were separated by stones marking the boundary between them (*Middoth*, I, 6). A Baraitha (*Yoma*, 19 a) expressly states that the bath was in the *hel*. As our fragment gives no hint that the priest attempted to remove Jesus and his companions from the place, and equally fails to reproach him on the ground of intruding on to holy ground, the ἀγνευτήριον can well be identified with the bath which stood in the *hel* above the Water-Gate. Obviously the word ἀγνευτήριον is the Greek translation of the Hebrew בית טבילה (Place of Bathing). This fact falls into line with the previous argument as to the identity of the term ἄγνος and ἀγλίζω with the Hebrew טבל (to immerse the body in water).

It is not so easy to account for another item in the priest's reproach. He blames the *disciples* for entering without previously bathing their feet. It is noteworthy that while the priest expects Jesus himself to have bathed and changed his garments, he demands of the disciples merely that they should have bathed their feet. The editors have not noticed this distinction, probably because in the reply of Jesus (ll. 41-2 of the Greek) this distinction

is omitted ("But I and my disciples who thou sayest have not bathed"). In fact, it is only Jesus who walks in the inner court, as is shown by ll. 8-9 (εἰσήγαγεν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγνευτήριον καὶ περιεπάτει ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, "He brought them into the very place of purification, and *he* was walking in the Temple"). The priest when uttering his reproach keeps this in mind, for (l. 12) he only complains that Jesus himself is walking about and looking at the vessels (τίς ἐπέτρεψέν σοι παρ[εῖν]; κ.τ.λ., "Who gave *thee* leave to walk? &c."). For a third time, too, the fragment (l. 16) makes it clear that Jesus was alone in walking within the court (ἀλλὰ μεμολυ[μμένος] ἐπάτησας τοῦτο τὸ ἱερὸν τ[όπον] . . ., "But defiled *thou* hast walked . . ."). By his walking within the court and viewing the vessels Jesus had infringed the purification-laws. But his disciples must have remained on the threshold of the chamber, and for that the bathing of feet was, according to the priest of the fragment, enough to satisfy the law. Now we know that not only priests had to be barefooted when entering the Temple and ascending the altar, and had to wash their feet, but the lay-pilgrims who ascended the Temple mount had also to remove their shoes. The Mishnah (*Berachoth*, IX, 5) formulates the rule: "No man shall enter the Temple mount with his staff, his shoe, his bag, or with the dust on his feet¹." Here, again, we are dealing with actual facts and not with later theory, for the Midrash (*Threni Rabba*, I, 16, § 47) records the following incident: "Miriam, the daughter of Boethos, the wife of the high-priest Joshua ben Gamala, desired to hear her husband read the lesson from the Law while robed in his high-priestly attire on the Day of Atonement. They laid for her carpets from the door of her house to the entrance of the Temple, so that her naked feet should not touch the ground. Nevertheless, her bare feet touched the ground." The commen-

¹ לא יכנס לחדר הבית במקלו ובמנעלו ובאפודתו ובאבק שעל רגליו. The Baraitha in *Berachoth*, 62 b, makes it clearer that the shoes were removed from the feet, for this reads במנעלי שברגליו.

tators explain that Miriam went barefooted because of the prohibition to wear shoes on the Fast. But in *Sifré* on Deut., § 305 (ed. Friedmann, 130 a) and *Aboth de R. Nathan*, XVII (ed. Schechter, 33 a), R. Johanan ben Zaccai relates to his pupils, when he saw the daughter of the once wealthy Nicodemus ben Gorion reduced to a condition of abject poverty: "The family of this woman never entered the Temple mount ¹ to worship until people previously spread for them Milesian cloth under their feet." This passage seems to refer to visits paid to the Temple on ordinary occasions. That the aristocracy visited the Temple for prayer on other days than the Day of Atonement is shown by the Mishnah (*Shekalim*, VI, 1). It may be concluded, therefore, that the aristocracy went barefooted whenever they entered the Temple for worship. Perhaps we may incidentally find here the explanation of a difficult passage in Juvenal (*Satire* vi, lines 156 ff.). The Roman poet refers to a gift of a jewel by Agrippa, the Jewish prince, to his sister Berenice, in a country "observant ubi festamero pede Sabbata reges," i. e. "where the kings observe the festival of the Sabbath barefooted."

But this custom did not apply only to the aristocracy, as the quotation given above from the Mishnah (*Berachoth*, IX, 5) indicates. This is confirmed by the statement of Josephus (*Wars*, iv. 3. 6) that when the Zealots held the inner court of the Temple, their impudence turned against God and they entered the sanctuary with soiled feet ². As Josephus specifically mentions the feet, it

¹ The Baraitha in *Kethuboth*, 66 b-67 a, reports that the father of this lady visited in this way the school (בית המדרש), but this reading cannot be anything but an error for the Temple (בית המקדש) as the parallels show. We find the same error in *Aboth de R. Nathan*, ch. vi (p. 16 b) where the wrong reading is בית המדרש in place of the correct reading בית המקדש in *Taanith*, 20 a.

² It is cited (Psalms of Solomon, ii. 2) as a gross desecration of the Altar that the enemies ascended it while wearing shoes. In Midrash *Threni Rabba* on II, 7, § 11 (after the correct reading in the *Aruch*, s. v. גלים, see Bacher, *Agada der Pal. Amoräer*, I, 538, n. 4) R. Samuel b. Nahman said:

follows that it was forbidden to enter the sanctuary with soiled feet. I cannot, however, assert that this objection to appearing in the Temple with soiled feet (in the phrase of the Mishnah given above "with the dust on the feet") necessarily implies that the feet were bathed, for I do not recall any passage which definitely states this. But it is certainly probable that, with the ever-increasing stringency of the purity-laws in the Temple, laymen were required to do as the priests did and wash their feet. Our Gospel-fragment would then be justified in claiming that the disciples of Jesus had no right to enter even the *hel* portion of the chamber of the inner court with unwashed feet.

The priest in the fragment boasts (l. 25) that he had himself performed the full rites of purification by bathing ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ τοῦ Δ(αυεί)δ, "in the pool of David." This cannot refer, as Schürer suggests (p. 20) to the brazen Sea of Solomon, for in that no one could bathe. The priest must, as the editors remark (p. 21), much more probably have bathed within the Temple area, in one of the bathing-places which I have described above. But we cannot define the place with precision. We can, however, assert without hesitation that the next clause of the priest's boast is thoroughly probable. The claim of the priest that "having descended by one staircase I ascended by another" is by no means a detail "invented for the sake of rhetorical effect" as our editors think (p. 12). For it is entirely in accord with the requirements of a very rigid observance of the purity-laws not to touch, when in a state of purification, the spots previously touched in a condition of defilement. The priest of our fragment would belong to the class of exaggerated saints of whom we have other knowledge in *Aboth de R. Nathan* (XII, p. 28 b). It is perhaps just because the priest assumes this extreme attitude on

"When the heathens entered the sanctuary they turned with scorning gestures and impudent blasphemies against Heaven, and made marks on the ground of the Temple with their shoes.

the purity-laws that Jesus retorts regarding the condition of the water in which the priest had necessarily bathed. The water for the Temple and for all purifications came from Etam (Yerushalmi, *Yoma*, III, 41 a, Midrash *Threni Rabba* on IV, 4, ed. Buber 72 b) from the so-called Pools of Solomon, SW. of Bethlehem. In the speech of Jesus in our fragment (ll. 32 ff.) he uses the phrase: "Thou hast washed in these *running* waters," undoubtedly with a purpose. He refers to the course by which the water reached Jerusalem, and he urges that this water, which the priest employs for the supreme purification, had on its long road to the Temple received many undesired defilements. The people in the villages through which the water passed or at the site of the great reservoirs in Etam, cast into the water dogs and swine to wash them. Jesus cannot have meant the dead bodies of these unclean animals, for he would not have refrained from strengthening his charge against the priest by that fact. The Jews certainly possessed dogs in Palestine, but it is not so certain that they possessed swine, though the prohibition to rear swine (*Sota*, 49 b) implies that the practice must have been not uncommon. Jesus further uses the strange expression "wherein dogs and swine have been cast *night and day*" in order to leave the priest no loophole for escape. At whatever period of the twenty-four hours the priest had chosen to take his ritual bath, he could not avoid the contamination of unclean beasts.

In one or two details the translation is inexact in the passage that follows. The Greek in ll. 34-38 runs: καὶ νιψάμε[ν]ος τὸ ἔκτος δέρμα ἐσμήξω, ὅπερ [κα]ὶ αἱ πόρναι καὶ αἱ αὐλητρίδες μυρί[ς]ου[σιν] καὶ λούσουσιν καὶ σμήχουσι [καὶ κ]αλλωπίζουσι. The editors translate: "And hast cleansed and wiped the outside skin which also the harlots and flute-girls anoint and wash and wipe and beautify for the lust of men." The word rendered wipe (σμήχειν) really means anointing with oil, after the Oriental manner, applying a cosmetic after the washing had occurred. In the case

of the harlots there is a double anointment, one before the washing (oil being used for soap), expressed by the Greek $\mu\upsilon\pi\lambda[\acute{\iota}]\nu[\sigma\omega]$, and the other after washing, expressed by $\sigma\mu\acute{\eta}\chi\nu\sigma\iota$, as in the case of the priest. The translation should thus run: "Thou hast cleansed and anointed the outside skin which also the harlots and flute-girls oil and wash and anoint and beautify." Whether the priests actually used oil at their bathing in the Temple is not elsewhere stated. For an account of the flute-players as harlots, see Pauly-Wissowa, *Realencyclopädie für das classische Alterthum*, I, 1816, s. v. *Ambubaia*; further the Gospel to the Hebrews, Hennecke, *Neutestam. Apokryphen*, p. 20, No. 10; and Grünbaum, *Z. D. M. G.*, XXXI, 1871, p. 246.

The most striking feature of this fragment is its presentment of the rigid observance of the purity-laws in the Temple. In no detail is the writer of the fragment ignorant of the law or guilty of gross error. Though the reference to the harlots and flute-girls may point to an extra-Palestinian and late origin, the material referring to the religious laws must have come from good sources. Whether this reference to harlots and flute-players necessarily implies a late date; whether it may be a pointed retort against critics of himself who had reproached Jesus for his association with the fallen; whether, further, we have a primitive or a late tradition in the picture here drawn of Jesus claiming for himself a spiritual superiority over his opponents ("But I and my disciples . . . have been dipped in the waters of eternal life")—a claim which Jesus nowhere makes in the canonical Gospels—on these matters I cannot suggest a solution, or even express an opinion. But the importance of the fragment for our knowledge of ancient Temple usages does not depend on the answer to these questions. It reproduces the exact conditions at a particular time in the Temple more accurately than Matt. xxiii. 25, where reference is made to this same cleansing of the

Temple vessels. The details of our text require further examination, but I am already convinced that we have here more original materials than are to be found in the Synoptics, who transfer from Jerusalem to Galilee the dispute between Jesus and the Pharisees on the purity-laws of the Temple.

A. BÜCHLER.